

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ,

No. C 14-80129 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

SEX OFFENDER TRACKING
PROGRAM,

**ORDER RE
PRE-FILING REVIEW**

Defendant.

Pro se Daniel Rodriguez is subject to pre-filing review. *Rodriguez v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-05257-MHP (N.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2009) (Judge Marilyn Hall Patel) (Dkt. No. 14).

Mr. Rodriguez has filed numerous actions in this district. *See, e.g., Rodriguez v. Padilla*, No. 3:06-cv-03412-JSW, *Rodriguez v. Shiba*, No. 3:06-cv-03415-MJJ, *Rodriguez v. Go*, No. 3:06-cv-03416-MMC, *Rodriguez v. Shiba*, Case No. 3:06-cv-05757-MJJ, *Rodriguez v. Go*, No. 4:06-cv-05758-PJH, *Rodriguez v. Padilla et al.*, No. 4:06-cv-06044-SBA, *Rodriguez v. City of San Francisco*, No. 3:07-cv-00103-MMC, *Rodriguez v. Hamilton*, No. 3:07-cv-03518-MJJ, *Rodriguez v. Office of the Chief Counsel*, No. 3:07-cv-03519-JCS, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-02639-SI, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-04645-MMC, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco*, No. 3:08-cv-05257-MHP, *Rodriguez v. City and County of San Francisco et al.*, No. 3:08-cv-05452-CRB, *Rodriguez v. Commissioner of Social Security*,

No. 3:09-cv-02668-MMC, *Rodriguez v. Dalt Hotel, L.P.*, No. 3:09-cv-02777-JSW, *Rodriguez v. Greyhound Lines, Inc.*, No. 4:09-cv-02939-SBA, *Rodriguez v. Hennessey*, No. 4:10-cv-02249-PJH, *Rodriguez v. Aguirre*, No. 3:10-cv-04036-RS, *Rodriguez v. The Supreme Court and the People of the State of California*, No. 3:10-mc-80216-CRB, *Rodriguez v. Aguirre*, No. 3:10-mc-80217-CRB, *Rodriguez v. Barrett*, No. 3:11-cv-03562-WHA, *Rodriguez v. Barrett*, No. 3:13-mc-80003-EMC.

This time, Mr. Rodriguez filed a one-page “complaint dismissal of the Sex Offenders SF US. Police Department [sic].” The complaint alleged no specific facts. The entirety of the complaint stated:

Dismissal of the Sex Offender SF. U.S. Police Department

Federal Rules of evidence, civil procedure 901 and 902

State Rules 3.514 to Rules 3.524

the case was solely as a probation condition. Pc 290

Letter of Adult probation Department Hall of Justice from Sabrina Shumake [phone number]

Many v. Dept of Social Services. 436 U.S. 645.98 S. Ct. 2018. 561. Ed.2d 611(978)

42 U.S.C. 1983 Claim. U.S. Government Law malpractice tort

California Government Claims Act. Government code sections 900 ET. Seq.

Demand to Trail [sic]

Mr. Rodriguez appended a letter from the Chief Adult Probation Officer of the City and County of San Francisco to Mr. Rodriguez, dated February 4, 2014, which stated: “This is to confirm that Daniel Rodriguez is no longer on Probation in San Francisco County.”

The complaint fails to comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The complaint fails to plead any factual allegations, identify the grounds for jurisdiction, and state the relief requested. The Clerk is directed not to file the complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 9, 2014.


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE